BROOKLINE PRESERVATION COMMISSION

July 8, 2008 MEETING MINUTES Public Safety Building, Community Room 350 WASHINGTON STREET

Commissioners Present: Flagler, Batchelor, DeWitt, Fingleton, Gross (arrived at

6:35pm), Kanes, King, Leary Absent: Elperin, Cohen, Ecker, Staff: Reed, Hardwicke, Wampler Members of the Public: see list

Chairwoman Flagler started the meeting at 6:17 p.m. Ms. Leary was appointed to vote for

Mr. Elperin

Minutes of the June 10, 2008 meeting

The Motion: Mr. DeWitt moved to approve the minutes.

Seconded: Ms. Leary

The Vote: Passed unanimously

68 Amory Street – Application to modify a Certificate of Appropriateness for changes to rear additions and removal of chimney.

Staff and the applicant's architect presented the application. Mr. Batchelor read the notes of Mr. Elperin, who was absent, and generally was reluctant to approve changes that further altered the rear elevation.

Mr. Batchelor and Mr. DeWitt expressed concern about the proposed removal of the chimney. Staff noted that typically removal of chimneys is not allowed, though the removal of auxiliary chimneys is sometimes permitted, this chimney's removal would be of a greater impact than typical allowed.

Ms. Flagler observed that the commissioners appeared to be ready to support some changes, while others required further study. Therefore, she asked for motions to approve portions of the changes and created a subcommittee to work with the applicant consisting of Mr. DeWitt, Mr. Kanes, and Ms. Leary

Mr. De Witt moved to approve the changes to the facade of the south wing as shown on the plans.

Seconded: Ms. Fingleton

The Vote: The motion passed unanimously

The Motion: Mr. DeWitt moved to approve the proposed second floor reconfiguration of the stained glass into one grouping of five windows.

Seconded: Ms. Fingleton

The Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

The Motion: Mr. DeWitt moved to approve the elongation of the kitchen windows on the north (driveway) elevation.

Seconded: Mr. Kanes

The Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

Outstanding issues remaining included the removal of the chimney, the addition of a door on the right side of the second floor bay window, the addition of a kitchen door on the first floor, and the configuration of the door and windows in the section between the two wings.

23 Prescott Street – Continuation on an Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct open pergola over uncovered porch on southwest corner of house.

It was noted that the subcommittee had met at the site and recommended that the Commission approve the revised design, as presented.

<u>The Motion:</u> Mr. Batchelor moved to approve the application based on the plans with new (smaller) 8" columns at the outside corner.

Seconded: Mr. DeWitt

The Vote: The motion passed. Dr. Gross was opposed.

20 Edgehill Road – Retroactive Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install chimney vents.

Dr. Gross recused himself.

Mr. DeWitt noted that the guidelines recommend retention of pre-existing chimney pots, but while the historic chimney pots survive on the front chimney, they have long-since been removed on the chimney in question. Staff noted that currently the guidelines do not cover the issue of chimney vents.

<u>The Motion:</u> Mr. DeWitt moved to retroactively approve the three cylindrical chimney vents because they are relatively small have been painted black and are not very conspicuous.

Seconded: Ms. Leary

The Vote: The motion passed unanimously with Mr. Gross recused.

57 Upland Road— Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to reside dormers with clapboards and to construct new porch roof balustrade to match front porch balustrade.

Staff presented the application but the applicant was not present, although he had been informed of the meeting. Staff noted that, based upon historic photographs, the original covering of the dormers cheek walls appeared to be wood shingles (the original roofing material also appeared to be wood shingle). It was also documented that the railing on the roof of the front portico was a more elaborate chinoiserie design than the first floor plain baluster railings proposed by the applicant.

Mr. De Witt observed that the existing first floor portico balustrade also appears to be a poor replication of the original railing, providing further reason to deny its use as pattern for a new roof balustrade.

<u>The Motion:</u> Ms. Fingleton moved to deny the construction of a new portico roof balustrade, citing the guidelines which called for replication of missing features using historic documentation.

Seconded: Mr. DeWitt

The Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

<u>The Motion:</u> Dr. Gross moved to deny the replacement of the asphalt shingles on the sides of the dormers with clapboards as there was no historic documentation for this change.

Seconded: Mr. Kanes

The Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

11 Hall Road—Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace previous picket fence with flat capped 42" picket fence on side and front; and construct 5' arbor at walkway to be connected to house and front fence with same 42" picket fence.

Staff and the applicant's landscape designer presented the application.

Ms. Daly, an abutter questioned the flat topped style of the fence and noted the proposed fence would be next to her fence which is of a different pointed picket design. Mr. Kanes

asked the Commission if there is precedent or guidelines about installing a fence of a different design next to a pre-existing fence. Mr. DeWitt replied that many historic photos show various fence designs situated next to each other.

Mr. DeWitt voiced concern over lattice wings attached to each side of the trellis arched arbor but not of the arch itself. The applicant agreed that the wings could be eliminated.

<u>The Motion:</u> Dr. Gross moved to approve in principle a flat topped fence and arbor as presented with the exception that the lattice wings of the arbor are not included, details to be approved by staff including the option of switching to a pointed picket fence matching the neighbor's fence, but any major changes to be brought before the commission.

Seconded: Ms. Leary

The Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

Other business

The Commissioners discussed the Rules and Regulations draft and approved changes to prepare the document for review and approval at a public hearing to be held in the fall. Mr. Kanes reported that he was working with town counsel on a clause regarding outstanding local historic district violations. The proposed regulation would allow the commissioners to approve a new application (which they are required to hear within a specific time frame according or Chapter 40C), but withhold its implementation until any previous violations are remedied. The commissioners decided to withhold a vote on the draft rules and regulations until a clean draft with renumbered sections may be presented.

Mr. Reed reported that the house at **49 Worthington Road** in the Cottage Farm Local Historic District had several items of work that has remained unfinished for several years. In order to get the work completed, Ms. Flager instructed the subcommittee to work with the owner. The original subcommittee consisted of Mr. Elperin and George Garfinkle, now deceased. Mr. De Witt and Mr. Kanes were added to Mr. Elperin's subcommittee.

Mr. Kanes and Mr. Reed reported on changes to the approved design for **92 Spooner** Road, and that the existing subcommittee was working with the architect to resolve these issues.

Staff reported that the owners at **50 Edgehill Road** had installed granite posts at the end of their driveway for a gate to be installed. No permit had been obtained for the posts and staff had been in contact to bring this matter before the Commission.

Adjournment

The Motion: Mr. Batchelor moved to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded: Ms. Fingleton

The Vote: The motion passed unanimously

The meeting was adjourned at